REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 2, 7 and 12 without disclaimer, and amend claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-18. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-18 remain pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the drawings are acceptable.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the following Remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. over <u>Lin</u> U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0180380 ("<u>Lin</u>").

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-18 are all patentable over Lin for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Among other things, the method of claim 1 includes limiting the output voltage when the sensed output voltage signal exceeds the output voltage threshold limit by limiting a pulse width of pulses output from a regulating pulse width modulator.

Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Lin</u> does not disclose such a feature.

The Office Action states that <u>Lin</u> discloses this feature "in figures 2-3."

Applicants respectfully disagree.

<u>Lin</u> teaches that when an open circuit condition exists, current sense comparator 42 compares the feedback signal FB which reflects the <u>current</u> through the CCFL against a preset value, and in response thereto shuts off the frequency sweeper 22. <u>Lin</u> at paragraph [0035], lines 34-40. So in the case of an open circuit, <u>Lin</u>: (1) does not compare a sensed output voltage to an output voltage threshold; and (2) turns off frequency sweeper 22, rather than limiting a pulse width of pulses output from a regulating pulse width modulator.

Lin also teaches that when an over-voltage condition occurs, protection comparator 62 compares OVP signal 66 against a threshold and "when OVP exceeds the threshold, the frequency sweeper [22] stops the frequency sweeping."

Appl. No. 10/596,330 Amendment and/or Response Reply to Office action of 25 January 2008

<u>Lin</u> at paragraph [0036], lines 20-22. So in the case of an overvoltage condition, <u>Lin</u> again turns off frequency sweeper 22 rather than limiting a pulse width of pulses output from a regulating pulse width modulator.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over <u>Lin</u>.

Claims 3-5

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and are deemed patentable over <u>Lin</u> for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 6

Among other things, the system of claim 6 includes means for limiting the output voltage when the sensed output voltage signal exceeds the output voltage threshold limit by limiting the pulse width of the pulses modulated by a pulse width modulating means.

As explained above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Lin</u> does not disclose limiting the output voltage when the sensed output voltage signal exceeds the output voltage threshold limit by limiting the pulse width of pulses modulated by a pulse width modulating means.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is patentable over <u>Lin</u>.

Claims 8-10

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 6 and are deemed patentable over <u>Lin</u> for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 6.

Claim 11

Among other things, the circuit of claim 11 includes a regulating pulse width modulator which limits the voltage at the output of the electronic ballast when the sensed output voltage signal exceeds the output voltage threshold limit by limiting a pulse width of pulses output from the regulating pulse width modulator.

As explained above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Lin</u> does not disclose limiting the output voltage when the sensed output voltage signal exceeds the output voltage threshold limit by limiting the pulse width of pulses Appl. No. 10/596,330 Amendment and/or Response Reply to Office action of 25 January 2008

output from a regulating pulse width modulator.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable over Lin.

Claims 13-18

Claims 13-18 depend from claim 11 and are deemed patentable over <u>Lin</u> for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-18 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT

By:

Kenneth D. Springer Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT One Freedom Square 11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260 Reston, Virginia 20190

Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724 Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740